

At the outset, Applicants note that the Office Action summary indicates that claim 12 is rejected. However, claim 12 is not formally rejected in the detailed action.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a body which supports the arm and which has a vent hole arranged on a lower side of the first floor from which air in the body is downwardly discharged to the second chamber upon a descending operation of the body.

The Office Action asserts that a combination of Teruo, George and Ikeda teaches many of the features recited in at least independent claim 1. The Office Action concedes, however, that the asserted combination of Teruo, George and Ikeda fails to disclose a vent hole arranged on a lower side of the first floor from which air, in the body is downwardly discharged to a second chamber upon descending; and the vent hole is a downward gap between a body cover and a base cover. Rather, the Office Action relies on Momoki, in its disclosure of a substrate conveyor robot, to make up for this shortfall. The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the gap of Momoki in the combination of Teruo, George and Ikeda in order to allow the robot to move vertically. This analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reason.

Momoki is directed to a substrate conveyor robot that inserts and removes a substrate to and from an arbitrarily positioned container (Abstract). Momoki teaches, at col. 5, lines 47-50 that a substrate conveyor robot 1 has a robot body 2 with a rotatable base 3. The Office Action asserts that a gap is formed between the robot body 2 and base 3 that can reasonably be considered to correspond to the recited gap between a body cover and base cover. The Office Action further alleges that when the base 3 descends into the robot body 2, air is downwardly discharged to the second chamber as recited in the pending claims. This assertion of the Office Action lacks merit.

The Office Action overly broadly construes what Momoki can reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, with respect to the subject matter of the pending

claims. The Office Action alleges that as the base 3 descends into the robot body 2, air that is discharged hits a protrusion that the Office Action calls an upper lip of base 3 which then directs the air downward. This assertion is unreasonable because there is nothing in Momoki that suggests that the air is directed downward after it is discharged from the space between base 3 and robot body 2. The air that is discharged from the space between base 3 and robot body 2 could go in any direction and is not necessarily directed downward as the Office Action asserts. As such, Momoki does not disclose the recited body which supports the arm and which has a vent hole arranged on a lower side of the first floor from which air in the body is downwardly discharged to the second chamber upon a descending operation of the body.

For at least the foregoing reason, no reasonable combination of Teruo, George, Ikeda and Momoki, which Applicants do not concede are combinable, can reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Further, and because Rapisarda is not applied in a manner to make up for the above-identified shortfall in the other applied references, dependent claims 2, 3 and 5-12 would also not have been suggested by the various combinations of currently-applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims on independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the various combinations of currently-applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Moshe K. Wilensky
Registration No. 56,263

JAO:MJS/mcp

Date: March 31, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--